DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 279 CE 077 973

AUTHOR	Hershey, Alan; Rosenberg, Linda
TITLE	School-to-Work Implementation Progress: The State Perspective in Early 1996.
INSTITUTION	Mathematica Policy Research, Princeton, NJ.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Planning and Evaluation Service.
REPORT NO	MPR-8292-610
PUB DATE	1996-05-13
NOTE	39p.
CONTRACT	EA95010001
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Comparative Analysis; *Education Work Relationship; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Financial Support; *Governance; Grants; National Programs; Partnerships in Education; Program Implementation; School Business Relationship; State Programs; Statewide Planning; Success; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	*School to Work Opportunities Act 1994

ABSTRACT

One-hour telephone discussions with state school-to-work (STW) directors provided information on STW state governance, partnership formation and funding, and implementation progress in 27 states. The most obvious difference in structures at the state level for implementing STW was whether STW responsibilities were assigned to a governing entity with a broader policy mandate or with a narrower function relating specifically to STW matters. States created a single-tier system of local STW partnerships or a two-tier system of regional and local partnerships. The primary purpose of regional bodies was to provide technical assistance to local partnerships. All 27 states received federal development and implementation grants. The most common uses of development grant funds were for forming substate partnerships, developing a state plan and preparing an application for an implementation grant, and developing strategies for improving public awareness of STW concepts. Conformity to federal legislative requirements and encouragement of local innovation appeared to be priorities in STW development, influencing the success of implementation. Successes in building state-level cooperation, promoting of STW concepts among key players, and creating materials were identified. Obstacles included the following: lack of understanding of what STW means among parent and students, school staff, and some state agency staff and issues limiting employer involvement (employer liability, child labor laws, and lack of financial incentives). (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Contract No.: EA95010001
MPR Reference No.: 8292-610

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 426 279

SCHOOL-TO-WORK IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS: THE STATE PERSPECTIVE IN EARLY 1996

May 13, 1996

Authors:

Alan Hershey
Linda Rosenberg

Submitted to:

U.S. Department of Education
Planning and Evaluation Service
600 Independence Ave., SW
Room 4103
Washington, DC 20202

Attention: David Goodwin

Submitted by:

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, N.J. 08543-2393
(609) 799-3535

Project Director:
Alan Hershey

CE077 913

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

Page

ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPING STW SYSTEMS 3

Definition and Resources of State-Level STW Partnerships 3
Definition of Substate Partnerships 9

FUNDING FOR STW AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS 15

Use of Development and Implementation Grants 17
Funding Local Partnerships 19

PERCEPTIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS AND CHALLENGES 22

Priorities in STW Development 24
Implementation Successes at the State and Substate Levels 26
Obstacles Encountered at the State and Substate Levels 28
Obstacles and Solutions to Involving Employers in STW 30
Role of the National STW Office 32

APPENDIX A: TOPICS FOR TELEPHONE DISCUSSIONS WITH STATE STW DIRECTORS 35

TABLES

Table		Page
1	STATE SCHOOL-TO-WORK STRUCTURE	5
2	THE SIZE OF SCHOOL-TO-WORK OFFICES	8
3	THE SUBSTATE SCHOOL-TO-WORK STRUCTURE AT THE REGIONAL AND LOCAL LEVEL	11
4	DEFINITION OF LOCAL PARTNERSHIP BOUNDARIES	16
5	USES OF FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS	18
6	SCHOOL-TO-WORK PARTNERSHIPS IN IMPLEMENTATION GRANTEE STATES (April 1996)	20
7	LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS' FISCAL AGENTS	23
8	PRIMARY AREAS OF PROGRESS IN SCHOOL-TO-WORK IMPLEMENTATION	27
9	PRIMARY OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED IN SCHOOL-TO-WORK IMPLEMENTATION	29

SCHOOL-TO-WORK IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS: THE STATE PERSPECTIVE IN EARLY 1996

Development of the school-to-work (STW) systems envisioned in the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (STWOA) requires ambitious change at the state and local level. Twenty-seven states have received federal grants totaling more than $204 million from fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995 funds, to develop state-level STW partnerships, promote the creation of local partnerships, fund local partnership activities through substate grants, and provide support and assistance to the local partnerships. About 775 local STW partnerships have been created and funded by substate grants in these 27 states, and an additional 80 local partnerships have received more than $45 million in direct federal grants.[1] Local partnerships are charged with creating school-based and work-based learning opportunities and linking them in meaningful ways, to help students develop awareness of career options and formulate career goals, plan their educational path through high school and postsecondary programs to pursue those goals, and develop the academic and workplace skills needed to succeed in an increasingly competitive and technological economy. These efforts require active collaboration of local schools and postsecondary institutions, employers, and organized labor, as well as other key partners identified at the local level.

This report provides early information on the progress, from the state perspective, of efforts to develop STW systems. Based on one-hour telephone discussions with state STW directors, this report is of necessity limited in scope, presenting only an overview of state governance, partnership formation and funding, and state directors' assessments of STW implementation progress. It represents the beginning of a longer-term, comprehensive evaluation of STW implementation, which will collect detailed data and issue in-depth reports.[2] The national evaluation includes three major components:

---

[1]Direct federal grants were awarded to 44 partnerships in 1994, and 36 more in spring 1996.

[2]The evaluation is required by the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, Title IV, Section 402(b), and is being conducted, under contract to the U.S. Department of Education, by Mathematica Policy Research,

1. ***Survey of all local STW partnerships*** that have so far received substate or direct federal implementation grants, to describe their composition, strategies, and implementation progress. This survey will be conducted in 1996, 1997, and 1999.

2. ***Study of student experiences and postsecondary progress,*** based on a survey of random samples of 12th-grade students in eight states in 1996, 1998, and 2000.[3] This survey will document students' involvement in STW activities and their postsecondary educational and employment outcomes, and changes in these measures from cohort to cohort as STW systems are strengthened.

3. ***In-depth case studies*** of local partnerships in the same eight states, as well as of selected direct federal grantees, based on intensive site visits, to identify the factors that promote or impede the development of comprehensive STW systems at the local level as envisioned in the STWOA.

This report is an effort to hasten the availability of information from the national evaluation. Detailed results from the national evaluation will be reported over an extended period, but the first report will not be available until fall 1996. To make results on some topics available more rapidly, the evaluation team conducted informal telephone discussions in March and April 1996 with STW directors in the 27 states that have received federal implementation grants.[4] This report summarizes the results of these discussions concerning three broad subjects:

1. The organizational framework for STW at the state and substate levels
2. Uses of STW funds for state-level activities and local partnership grants
3. State-level perceptions of implementation successes and challenges

---

Inc. (MPR) and its subcontractors, MPR Associates, Inc., and Decision Information Resources, Inc.

[3]This component of the evaluation is being conducted in Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

[4]Appendix A lists the topics for these discussions. Although most data were collected in telephone discussions, information about the eight states included in the in-depth evaluation components was collected as part of initial case study site visits in February and March 1996.

ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPING STW SYSTEMS

Building STW systems depends on the creation of effective partnerships at both the state and local level. Partnerships are recognized as essential in the STWOA, for two important reasons. First, developing productive workplace experiences for students, to help introduce them to career options and develop the skills they will need in future jobs, requires cooperation between schools and employers. Second, knitting together historically distinct education and training programs supported by diverse funding sources into one system requires joint efforts by multiple government agencies and educational institutions. Discussions with state directors focused first, therefore, on clarifying how state and local partnerships have been defined.

Definition and Resources of State-Level STW Partnerships

The ultimate results of STW system building will be observed at the local level in the changing educational experiences of American youths. The development of state-level partnerships and resources, however, will have important effects on the direction and progress of STW system implementation. State-level policy and administrative structures for STW will determine how closely STW system development is integrated with broader concerns for economic and workforce development and other educational reforms. State-level structures will also affect who most heavily influences the distribution of STW funding and whose leadership establishes the emphasis and priorities for STW. How choices of state-level governance approaches for STW end up affecting the progress and direction of reforms cannot be concluded this early or based on the preliminary data collected for this paper. In-depth case studies as part of the national evaluation, however, will address these issues and document the historical and political factors affecting state-level STW partnerships. For this preliminary report, we sought to establish a basic descriptive foundation for those later assessments, examining three dimensions of state STW structures:

1. The designation of a STW policy-making entity and the breadth of its responsibilities for STW and other related policy matters

2. The location of the STW office within state government

3. The staff resources dedicated to STW development

STW Policy-Making Bodies at the State Level. The most obvious difference in structures at the state level for implementing STW is whether STW responsibilities are assigned to a governing entity with a broader policy mandate or with a narrower function relating specifically to STW matters (Table 1). Almost all of the states we contacted have established a state structure for STW.[5] In nearly half of the states, the entity described by the state director as having primary policy-making and implementation responsibility for STW was created solely for that purpose. In 13 states, however, the entity responsible for STW policy is a board, council, or commission--often created even before the receipt of STW funds--that has authority over more general workforce or human resource development policy. These groups also have responsibility for a variety of program initiatives and funding streams, such as One Stop Career Centers, Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs, welfare reform, adult literacy, and Perkins Act funds. This approach is clearly an effort to overcome the fragmentation and lack of coordination that have often plagued related programs supported by separately administered funding streams.

Where responsibility for STW policy belongs to a governing body with a broader mandate, a subcommittee or subsidiary body is often designated to take the lead role in STW decisions and to oversee a staff office devoted to STW. In Utah, for example, the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) has responsibility for all job-training issues and is the overall policy entity, but it has formed the School-to-Careers Committee. This SJTCC subcommittee oversees the work of still a third committee, the School-to-Careers Standards Committee, made up of representatives of regional partnerships and state agencies. The STW office implements the decisions of these entities. Similarly, in Iowa the Workforce Development Council has created a subsidiary STW council, and in Ohio the Governor's Human Resource Investment

---

[5]A few states that were awarded federal implementation grants in 1995 (for example, Florida and Hawaii) are still forming their state-level structure for STW.

TABLE 1

STATE SCHOOL-TO-WORK STRUCTURE

	Overall Policy Entity	Broader Responsibility than STW?	STW Director Appointed By:
Alaska	Alaska Human Resources Investment Council	Yes	Commissioner of Education
Arizona	STW Advisory Council	No	Governor
Colorado	Workforce Coordinating Council	Yes	Lieutenant Governor
Florida	STW Implementation Leadership Team	No	Commissioner of Education
Hawaii	STW Executive Council	No	STW Executive Council
Idaho	STW Collaborative Team	No	Collaborative Team
Indiana	STW Policy Board	No	Workforce Development Commissioner
Iowa	Iowa Workforce Development Council	Yes	Workforce Development Coordinator
Kentucky	Kentucky Workforce Partnership Council	Yes	Secretary, Workforce Development Cabinet
Maine	Career Opportunities 2000 Executive Committee	No	Commissioner of Education
Maryland	Career Connections State Management Team	No	Superintendent of Education
Massachusetts	Governor's Advisory Council on STW Transition	No	Executive Committee
Michigan	Michigan Jobs Commission	Yes	Michigan Jobs Commission CEO
Nebraska	Nebraska Industrial Competitiveness Alliance	Yes	Nebraska Industrial Competitiveness Alliance
New Hampshire	State STW Team	No	Director of Adult Learning and Rehabilitation, Department of Education
New Jersey	STW Partnership	No	Commissioner of Education
New York	State Advisory Council	No	Assistant Commissioner of Education
North Carolina	Commission on Workforce Preparedness	Yes	Executive Director, Commission on Workforce Preparedness
Ohio	Governor's Human Resource Investment Council	Yes	Lieutenant Governor
Oklahoma	STW Executive Council	No	State Board of Vocational-Technical Education
Oregon	Workforce Quality Council and State Board of Education	Yes	Superintendent of Public Instruction
Pennsylvania	Interagency Team	No	Secretary of Education
Utah	State Job Training Coordinating Council	Yes	Superintendent, Office of Education
Vermont	Human Resource Investment Council	Yes	Governor
Washington	Governor's School-to-Work Transition Task Force	No	n.a.*
West Virginia	STW Steering Committee	No	Steering Committee
Wisconsin	Human Resource Investment Council	Yes	Secretary of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

*Washington State has not established a STW office. STW development is managed in each of the partner agencies.

Council has established a STW subcommittee. In states where STW is the primary responsibility of the governing body, there is less need for multilevel governance. In Pennsylvania, for example, an interagency team was formed specifically to develop STW systems; it directly oversees the state's STW office.

The membership of a state's STW policy-making entity usually is drawn from the key state agencies with an interest in STW and other key stakeholders outside state government. In Hawaii, for example, members of the STW Executive Council include representatives from the Departments of Education, Labor and Industrial Relations, Human Services, and Economic Development and Tourism; the University of Hawaii; the Council on Vocational Education; the state private industry council; and private business and organized labor. Most other states have similar representation on their boards, and these boards usually include representation of business and organized labor. There is some variation, however, in how salient or dominant a role private-sector representatives play in these governing entities. In North Carolina, for example, more than half of the Commission on Workforce Preparedness (including its chairman) are from the private sector. In other states, STW policy-making bodies may include business and labor representatives, but their membership consists more heavily of representatives from relevant state agencies. In some instances, employers, labor representatives, and other stakeholders have found a role in STW development in other bodies, such as the subcommittees or subsidiary bodies that have taken on important responsibilities in developing STW.

These STW policy-making bodies are almost always appointed by governors. The only exceptions are a few states where STW responsibility is assigned to an interagency team whose midlevel management members are designated by the heads of the agencies they represent.

The STW Offices. All of the states except Hawaii and Washington have created a STW office or staff. These offices serve as staff to the STW policy bodies, but sometimes are organizationally housed in one of the several state agencies that participate on the policy board. For example, an interagency team is responsible for Pennsylvania's STW implementation, but the STW staff is organizationally within the

Department of Education, and the Secretary of Education appoints its director. Similarly, the Oregon STW office serves as staff to the Workforce Quality Council but is housed in the Department of Education. In Nebraska, the STW office operates out of the Department of Economic Development but is directly responsible to the Industrial Competitive Alliance.

Other STW offices have been established as independent entities or as staff to recently created policy bodies that are outside traditional line agencies. In Michigan, for example, the STW office is part of the Michigan Jobs Commission, and in North Carolina, the staff is part of the Commission on Workforce Preparedness. In Kentucky, staff members are hired directly by the Workforce Partnership Council, and in Iowa, a STW staff has been created as part of the Workforce Development Council. In a few states (for example, Arizona, Colorado, Ohio, and Vermont), STW staffs are part of the office of the governor or lieutenant governor.

In many (but not all) cases, the organizational home of the STW office provides some indication of where the most active leadership in STW development resides within the state bureaucracy. Although most state directors stress that STW efforts at the state level are collaborative, they generally are able to name the agency or agencies most actively involved in policy-making deliberations and implementation efforts, and these usually include the agency where the STW office is located.

Practical matters also affected how some STW offices were created, however, and their physical location does not always correspond to their organizational lines of responsibility. In Idaho, for example, the STW Collaborative Team appointed by the governor hired a STW staff and physically located the STW office in space contributed by a corporate member of the state partnership. Similarly, in West Virginia, the STW staff is located in a Department of Education office, although it is organizationally responsible to the multi-agency STW Steering Committee.

STW Staffs. Staff resources vary considerably (Table 2). Vermont's office contains only 1.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members (a full-time director and a half-time administrative assistant), while

TABLE 2

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL-TO-WORK OFFICES

Number of Full-Time Equivalent Staff Members in STW Office[a]	Number of States[b]
3.0 or Less	5
3.1 - 6.0	9
6.1 - 10	6
More than 10	2

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

[a]Includes only staff members physically located at the STW office, whether hired for the STW office or on loan from other agencies. Does not include staff members who work on STW from their home agencies.

[b]Information on STW office size is not available for four states. In two of these states, the respondent reported the combined number of staff members who work on STW out of the STW office and out of their home agencies. In a fifth state, Washington, there is no STW office, but it was reported that a total of 8-10 full-time equivalent staff work on STW issues from their respective agencies.

Iowa's STW office has approximately 15 FTEs. Particularly where staffs are larger, they are often made up to a considerable extent of staff members on loan from other state agencies or of staff reassigned to the office from within the home agency. Relatively few new staff have been hired to work on STW. In some states, the STW office staff is supported, at least in part, by regular state agency budgets instead of by the federal STW implementation grants. In Florida, for example, all seven professional staff members in the STW Joint Services Office are paid from general state revenue and other non-STW funding streams. In Michigan, 4 of 10 STW office positions are supported by state funds other than the STW grant.

The size of STW office staffs is only an approximate indication of the extent of staff resources devoted to STW implementation. In some states, particularly where the STW office staff is small, substantial time commitments are made by staff members still located in various state agencies. In Colorado, for example, the four-member STW office coordinates the work of an interagency team made up of staff members committed full- or half-time from six different state agencies. In Vermont, an estimated 4.5 FTEs working out of their home agencies supplement the small staff of the STW office.

Definition of Substate Partnerships

If the STW legislation affects students' experiences and success, it will be because of the efforts of substate partnerships. These partnerships are the vehicles for collaborative efforts to change school and work-based learning opportunities and the channel through which financial resources are disbursed to support the development of STW systems. On the basis of discussions with state directors, it appears that the ways in which substate partnerships are defined reflect several factors, to different degrees across states. These factors are:

- Natural alliances formed among school districts, postsecondary institutions, employers, and others, based on their past associations and collaborations
- State-level strategies to deploy STW resources and create partnerships throughout the state

- The advantages of broad partnerships encompassing diverse resources, and the countervailing advantages of small-scale local initiatives as the basis for partnerships
- Existing definitions of substate areas (such as economic development regions, labor market areas, JTPA service delivery areas, intermediate school districts or service areas, and Tech-Prep consortia)

These factors are reflected in states' decisions on whether to create a bi-level partnership structure or just a single level of local partnerships, and in their approach to forming local partnerships.

Formation of Substate Regional Bodies. In balancing these factors, a major choice states have faced is whether to create a single-tier system of local STW partnerships or a two-tier system of regional and local partnerships. Particularly where local partnerships typically encompass only one or a few small school districts, regional bodies can promote mutual exchange of information among local partnerships. They can also provide a vehicle for delivering technical assistance and pooling resources for specialized purposes (such as staff development). About half of the states have already begun or have planned to create two-tiered systems (Table 3). Colorado and Idaho, for example, have each defined 6 substate regions, and Massachusetts has defined 16. Most often, these regions are based on existing structures serving defined geographic areas (such as JTPA service delivery areas, community college service areas, and labor market areas). Sometimes, the regional entity is an adaptation of an existing regional administrative body. For example, in Massachusetts, the regional employment boards were created by redefining the roles of private industry councils. These boards were not formed to develop local STW partnerships, but to coordinate workforce development activities in their regions. In one state (Colorado), however, regional bodies are being formed by creating councils made up of delegates named by local partnerships.

The primary purpose of regional STW bodies is to provide technical assistance to local partnerships. A few states (for example, Arizona, Oregon, and Indiana) are also giving the intermediate-level

TABLE 3

THE SUBSTATE SCHOOL-TO-WORK STRUCTURE AT THE REGIONAL AND LOCAL LEVEL

State	Number of Regional Entities[a]	Number of Local Partnerships[b]
Alaska	8	23
Arizona	13	NA[c]
Colorado	6	37
Florida	0	28
Hawaii	0	25
Idaho	6	0[d]
Indiana	15	NA[c]
Iowa	15	126
Kentucky	0	22
Maine	7	24
Maryland	0	11
Massachusetts	16	42
Michigan	0	44
Nebraska	0	12
New Hampshire	7	34
New Jersey	15	21
New York	0	59[e]
North Carolina	0	60
Ohio	12	0[d]
Oklahoma	11	0[d]
Oregon	15	NA[f]
Pennsylvania	0	56
Utah	0	9
Vermont	0	14
Washington	0	64[g]
West Virginia	11	33
Wisconsin	0	31
Total	**157**	**775**

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

TABLE 3 *(continued)*

[a]Not all regional entities are partnerships as defined in the STWOA; some are regional support and technical assistance offices. Regional partnerships in Ohio, New Jersey, and Colorado are just being formed.

[b]Includes only partnerships that have received substate grants supported by federal funds under the STWOA. In three states (Arizona, Indiana, and Oregon), the substate partnerships are considered regional entities, and local partnerships are being formed. Additional local partnerships exist in many states that are not included in this column: partnerships that have received direct federal grants; partnerships that have received state-funded grants; and partnerships that have applied for substate grants but not yet received them. These additional partnerships are included in Table 6.

[c]In Indiana and Arizona, the regional partnerships are expected to form more local partnerships, but the number of such local partnerships is uncertain, since the process has just begun.

[d]Local partnerships are being formed. In Idaho, this process is not complete. The state STW director thought there would be no more than 24 local partnerships. In Ohio, the state has funded 53 local partnerships, but substate federally funded grants have not been awarded. In Oklahoma, the STW director expects there to be 35 to 40 local partnerships formed out of the current grant application process.

[e]Recent local applications in New York are still being processed. Some are likely to result in awards to new partnerships beyond the 59 previously funded.

[f]In Oregon, the 15 regional partnerships in many instances have formed more local partnerships. A few of these second-tier partnerships have even awarded substantial grants to multi-district partnerships at an even more local level. However, information was not available at the state level concerning how many of these second- and third-tier partnerships have been formed.

[g]In Washington, grants have been made with a combination of state and federal funds. Some of the 64 partnerships also received state funds, and additional partnerships have received grants only from state funds.

partnerships authority to award grants to local partnerships. Regional entities in other states will only review local applications or endorse applications for local implementation grants.

These counts of the number of regional and local partnerships, however, reflect some variation in states' definitions. It is common for partnerships that include multiple school districts to make small disbursements to individual districts (or even to individual schools) to help them develop specific program components, often in partnership with employers. These "very local" partnership activities are not recognized in Table 3, because supporting them is part of the normal fiscal role of local partnerships; these are not funding actions that recognize the creation and existence of ongoing partnership entities with general STW development responsibilities. For example, Florida has funded 28 "regional" partnerships that correspond to the state's community college service districts. Although the regional partnerships may make grants to more local entities, it appears that these grants are likely to be for specific program development efforts, rather than to partnerships constituted as specified in the STWOA. Therefore, the 28 partnerships are treated here as "local" entities. On the other hand, Oregon calls its 15 substate entities "local" partnerships, but in fact they operate at a regional level and most have given out substantial awards to more local partnerships; they are thus treated here as regional partnerships.[6]

The potential usefulness of regional STW entities has been recognized even in some of the states where they have not been created. For example, the state STW coordinator in Maryland talked about bringing groups of local partnerships together to form a regional focus, in much the same way as Colorado is now doing. In Pennsylvania (one of the larger states without an intermediate-level structure), serious consideration has been given to creating regional bodies. Progress has been thwarted so far, however, by the multiplicity of conflicting definitions for existing regions (JTPA service delivery areas, industrial

---

[6]In some cases, these second-tier partnerships in Oregon have even made substantial grants to partnerships involving multiple school districts and their postsecondary and business partners at a still more local level.

resource centers, intermediate-education service districts, and regional planning areas) and reluctance to add another "nonconforming" set of regional definitions.

Creation of Local Partnerships. Most of the 27 states with implementation grants have recognized partnerships created at the local level and provided funding for them, although additional partnerships are likely to be funded.[7] So far, 775 local partnerships have been funded with substate federal grants for either planning or implementation activities. (In three states, 43 regional entities are the most local partnerships that have been directly funded by the state, bringing the total number of substate grants to 818.) The number of local partnerships ranges from 9 in Utah to 126 in Iowa (Table 3). Most states have already received grant applications from, or even provided funding to, local partnerships that encompass all of their school districts.

Several states have not yet awarded funds statewide, however, and these states expect to receive further grant applications and fund additional partnerships if federal STW funding continues to be available. As a result, the eventual number of local STW partnerships in the 27 states is likely to be still higher. For example, Iowa has provided planning grants to 111 local partnerships that so far include about 200 of the state's 387 local education agencies, and Washington has so far awarded substate federal grants to partnerships that include a little more than half of the state's school districts. Indiana's 15 regional partnerships, still in the formative stages, are expected to make local partnership grants. North Carolina has funded 60 local partnerships but expects to fund more when they are deemed ready. In Idaho, the process of forming local partnerships within regions is not yet completed, but it is expected there will be about 24 local partnerships. The process for awarding grants to local partnerships has not been completed in Ohio or Oklahoma. These states will also increase the total number of partnerships.

---

[7]Several states are still reviewing local partnership grant applications and have not actually awarded substate grants. State STW directors in these states expect to announce the awards shortly.

States have used a variety of existing configurations (such as local school districts, local labor markets, and JTPA service delivery areas) to define the geographic areas served by their local partnerships (Table 4). For the most part, states use a consistent basis for defining the geographic area their local partnerships covered. For example, Maryland's 11 partnerships are all based on the state's 11 JTPA service delivery areas, which in turn include from one to five counties each.[8] Kentucky's 22 local partnerships correspond to local labor market areas that were defined by a University of Kentucky study. A few states, however, have allowed variation in how local partnership areas are defined. Wisconsin, for example, allowed partnerships to define themselves, resulting in a variety of different geographic definitions of local partnerships.

FUNDING FOR STW AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS

All 27 states have received federal development and implementation grants. Development grants, awarded in fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995, were awarded to aid states in planning STW systems. When they received implementation grants (8 states beginning in 1994 and 19 in 1995), the STWOA required that they allocate at least 70 percent of these funds to substate partnerships, leaving only 30 percent for state-level activities.[9] Discussions with state STW directors provided some insight into how funds from development and implementation grants have been used at the state level, and provided data on the total number of partnerships funded from these federal grants and other sources.

---

[8]Maryland has a twelfth service delivery area that covers Baltimore City. Since the Baltimore City partnership received a direct federal implementation grant, it is not counted in Table 3 as a substate partnership.

[9]In the first year of the implementation grant, states are to pass on at least 70 percent of the award to local partnerships. In subsequent years, the states are to pass on even more--80 percent in year 2 and 90 percent in years 3, 4, and 5--to the local partnerships.

TABLE 4

DEFINITION OF LOCAL PARTNERSHIP BOUNDARIES

Predominant Basis	Number of States
Local School Districts	8
Local Labor Market Areas	7
JTPA Service Delivery Areas	2
Intermediate-Education Districts	2
Single High Schools	1
Tech-Prep Consortia	1
Counties	1
Community College Service Area	1
Unknown	3

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

JTPA = Job Training Partnership Act.

Use of Development and Implementation Grants

Detailed accounts of grant expenditures were not obtained from state directors, but they were asked to identify the major purposes for which development and implementation grants funds were used (Table 5). The most common uses of development grant funds were for the most basic steps in creating a STW infrastructure and channels for distribution of grant resources: forming substate partnerships, developing a state plan and preparing an application for an implementation grant, and developing strategies for improving public awareness of STW concepts. Some state directors mentioned other specific activities that development grants supported. In Maine, for example, a large portion of the development grant supported efforts to develop state industry skill standards. In West Virginia, most of the development money was used to support travel and other expenses for statewide stakeholders' meetings in preparation for drafting a state STW plan. Other states devoted a considerable portion of their funds to creating the substate partnership structure. Arizona allocated its development funds across the four main areas that state STW coordinators most often cited: (1) forming and supporting substate partnerships, (2) developing the state structure and plan, (3) developing technical assistance, and (4) creating a marketing plan.

State-level activities changed somewhat when implementation grants were received. With the new funding, activities shifted from the planning and development of the state's plan and the creation of local partnerships to strengthening these partnerships and designing state-level support for local activities (Table 5). States were less likely to devote resources to planning activities. Instead, they turned to formally setting up their state STW offices and further supporting STW through such activities as designing STW curricula, providing technical assistance to local partnerships, and marketing STW concepts throughout the state. For example, North Carolina, which had spent much of its development funds on meetings to develop a STW system, spent a much larger part of the state portion of the implementation grant on public relations and marketing STW.

TABLE 5

USES OF FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

Use of Grant	Number of States Citing Use	
	Development Grant	Implementation Grant
Developing State Structure and Plan (developing grant application)	14	--
Forming and Supporting Substate Partnerships	12	17
Marketing Plan/Public Awareness	11	12
Developing and Providing Technical Assistance	11	14
Conducting Meetings and Forums	10	4
Developing State Skill Standards	6	7
Designing Curricula Relevant to STW	3	9
Promoting Business Involvement	3	3
Developing Data and Information Systems	2	--
Developing a System for Labor Market Analysis	2	3
Developing Career Clusters	2	--
Funding Pilot Programs at the Local Level	1	--
Promoting Outreach for Special Student Populations	1	4
State Administrative and Staff Costs	--	10
Evaluation	--	6
Staff Development	--	8

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

NOTE: In all interviews, the respondents were asked to break down the uses of their development and implementation grants. Some respondents were able to account for 100 percent of the funds, and others were only able to identify the primary uses of the grant.

Funding Local Partnerships

States have followed two general strategies in providing implementation funding to local partnerships. Some states have awarded grants to all of the local partnerships formed, although they may have been funded at varying amounts. For example, Vermont funded all of its 14 local partnerships from its first-year federal implementation grant. In these states, the number of partnerships that have received implementation grants equals the total number of partnerships identified (Table 6).

Other states are awarding implementation grants in cycles of funding as local partnerships become fully formed and develop satisfactory plans. In Maryland, for example, only 3 of the state's 11 local partnerships were funded in the first wave of local implementation grants, with grants averaging almost $1 million, but the remaining partnerships were given smaller planning grants. In these states, the total number of identified partnerships exceeds the number that have received implementation grants in 1995-1996.

In many cases, the distinction between the "development" and "implementation" purposes of federal funding has been blurred when states make substate grants. In several states, federal development funds that were not expended have been carried forward and pooled with federal implementation funds to support grants to local partnerships for both planning and implementation. On the other hand, some states have been using federal implementation funds to make distinct types of grants to local partnerships, either for planning or for implementation, depending on the stage of readiness they attribute to local partnerships.

Considerable variation exists in the extent of progress made in "rolling out" federal implementation funds to local partnerships. In part, the number of partnerships funded is related to when the state received its federal implementation grant. Table 6 shows that six of the eight states that received grants in 1994--Maine, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, and Wisconsin--have provided implementation funding to all of their identified substate partnerships. A seventh initial awardee--Massachusetts--has funded more than half of its partnerships with implementation grants and the rest with planning grants, and Kentucky

TABLE 6

SCHOOL-TO-WORK PARTNERSHIPS IN IMPLEMENTATION GRANTEE STATES
April 1996

	Partnerships Receiving Sub-State Federally Funded Grants[a]					
	(1) Total (Unduplicated)[b]	(2) Development or Planning	(3) Implementation	(4) Direct Federal Grantees[c]	(5) State-Funded and Non-Funded[d]	(6) All Identified Partnerships (1)+(4)+(5)
Alaska	23	12	11	1	13	37
Arizona[e]	13	8	5	2	1	16
Colorado	37	30	7	1	2	40
Florida	28	28	7	1		29
Hawaii[f]	25	22	3		1	26
Idaho[g]	0	0	0	1	23	24
Indiana[h]	15	15	0	1		16
Iowa[i]	126	111	15	1		127
Kentucky	22	13	18			22
Maine	24	6	24			24
Maryland[j]	11	12	3	1		12
Massachusetts	42	19	23			42
Michigan	44	44	44	2		46
Nebraska	12	3	12	2		14
New Hampshire	34	21	13	1		35
New Jersey	21	0	21			21
New York[k]	59	42	17	1		60
North Carolina	60	51	22		6	66
Ohio[l]	0	0	0	2	53	55
Oklahoma[m]	0	0	0	3	40	43
Oregon	15	10	11			15
Pennsylvania	56	35	21	2	21	79
Utah	9	9	9	1		10
Vermont	14	5	14			14
Washington[n]	64	64	0	3	43	110
West Virginia	33	12	11		22	55
Wisconsin	31	31	31	3		34
Total	**818**	**603**	**342**	**29**	**225**	**1,072**

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

TABLE 6 *(continued)*

NOTE: In general, this table only includes grants to local partnerships. However, if states have awarded grants only to regional partnerships (as is the case in Arizona, Indiana, and Oregon), these regional grants are included in the table.

[a]Direct federal grantees not funded through substate grants are not included in these columns unless they have already been incorporated in a partnership that has received a substate grant.

[b]The unduplicated count of partnerships that have received sub-state federally funded grants is sometimes less than the sum of planning and implementation grants because some partnerships have received both types of grants.

[c]Includes federal grants to local partnerships, to partnerships in urban/rural high poverty areas, and to Native American partnerships. A total of 81 such direct grants have been awarded to 80 local partnerships (2 in Baltimore). This column does not, however, include all direct federal grants; eleven partnerships that received such grants and then became part of partnerships that received substate grants are included instead in Column 1. They are in Arizona, Florida (2 partnerships), Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Oregon (3 partnerships), and Washington (2 partnerships). In addition, 40 direct grants were made to partnerships in states other than the 27 that have received implementation grants.

[d]Includes partnerships that have received only state-funded grants so far, as well as partnerships that have been formed and applied for STW funding, but have not yet been awarded grants.

[e]In Arizona, three partnerships have received direct federal grants, but one of them had also received a substate grant. Substate funding is being used until the start date for federal funding; this partnership is thus counted once in this table, as a partnership with substate funding.

[f]One partnership in Hawaii declined planning funds, but is proceeding with planning activities.

[g]In Idaho, the formation of partnerships is not complete. The state STW director thought there would be no more than 24 local partnerships.

[h]In Indiana, the state is funding regions. The regions will fund local partnerships at their own discretion.

[i]In Iowa, three kinds of grants are planned, but two have so far been awarded out of federal implementation funds: 115 local partnerships received planning grants, and 13 received system-building grants. Future grants will be awarded for implementation when local partnerships are deemed ready.

[j]Maryland made planning grants to 12 partnerships, but one of them received a direct federal grant, and has so far not received a substate implementation grant. That partnership is included in Column 4, and not in Column 1.

[k]New York STW staff reported that additional grants are being awarded, mostly extending funding to the 59 original grantees, but that some grants will be to new partnerships. Staff's informal estimate was that these grants will bring the number of funded partnerships to 64. Ambiguities arise because some applications are from partnerships whose members may earlier have been part of another partnership.

[l]Using several types of state funds, Ohio has awarded grants to 53 local partnerships. The first substate grants supported by federal implementation funding will be awarded in fall 1996.

[m]In Oklahoma, the STW director expects there to be 35 to 40 local partnerships formed out of the current grant application process.

[n]Washington has provided grants mostly to local school districts and to some multi-district partnerships. The formation of larger-scale regional partnerships, and some combining of local districts into multi-district local partnerships, are expected to continue.

has given implementation grants to 18 of its 22 defined partnerships. Of the states that received implementation grants in fall 1995, several had not yet completed the process of awarding substate grants at the time the survey was conducted. These states--Idaho, Indiana, Ohio, and Oklahoma--intend to complete the process in the next several months. The other recent awardees are funding their partnerships according to a roll-out plan; it may take several more years before all local partnerships are fully funded in these states. In Washington, although some funding has been provided to many local school districts, there is ongoing interagency discussion at the state level of how to define and fund local partnerships across the state.

Financial responsibility at the local partnership level is assumed most often by local school districts, community colleges, or private industry councils (Table 7). Most states did not have any particular requirement for who should serve as fiscal agent, although they specify conditions that fiscal agents must meet. As a result, in most states, there is some variety in the type of entity that serves as fiscal agent. In Kentucky, for example, six different types of fiscal agents are serving in various local partnerships.

PERCEPTIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS AND CHALLENGES

States face three major tasks in building STW systems: (1) creating a collaborative partnership at the state level, (2) fostering the creation and creative work of local partnerships, and (3) providing useful guidance to local partnerships on how to develop STW systems consistently while still encouraging local innovation in response to local problems and opportunities. For many of the 27 states, work on these tasks is still in its early stages. To assess early progress in STW system development, we discussed five issues with state STW directors:

1. How they are translating the federal STWOA into a state "model" for STW systems, and what priorities, if any, they are conveying to local partnerships
2. The particular aspects of STW development they perceive as showing the most substantial progress at the state and local partnership levels

TABLE 7

LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS' FISCAL AGENTS

Entity	Number of States with Entity as Fiscal Agent in Any Partnership
Local School District	22
Community College/Two-Year Institution	14
Private Industry Council	10
Vocational District	6
Other Educational District	6
Four-Year Institutions	4
Economic Development Agency	3
Workforce Development Agency	3
Chamber of Commerce	3
Training Center	2
Foundation	2
Indian Tribe/Native Corporation	2
Education Collaboratives	1
County Commission	1
Tech- Prep Consortia	1
Department of Employment and Training Field Office	1
Local Bank	1
Regional Planning Organization	1
Employer	1
County	1
Community-Based Organization	1

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

NOTE: Most states did not require that one particular entity be the fiscal agent for STW. Therefore, state STW directors typically named several types of fiscal agents serving in their states. As a result, the total number of states far exceeds the number (27) of implementation grantees.

3. Any particular challenges or obstacles they perceive that have affected progress at the state or local level

4. The particular challenges of involving employers in local partnerships to provide workplace experiences for students

5. The role of the national School-to-Work Office in supporting state implementation efforts

Priorities in STW Development

Discussion of state "models" for STW development generally indicated two objectives that most states are pursuing: (1) conformity to federal legislative requirements, and (2) encouragement of local innovation and problem solving within the legislative framework. Most often, state directors responded to questions about system models by referring to the guidelines they had given local partnerships applying for substate grants, requirements that generally mirrored those stated for the composition and activities of local partnerships in the STWOA. This is a natural and logical finding, given the priority states have given to creating a strategy for "rolling out" federal funds to the local level in adherence to legal requirements.

State directors usually expressed some reluctance to prescribe a statewide approach to STW system development, stressing that they wanted local partnerships to devise their own strategies to suit their own local labor markets and business and educational resources. Directors did stress the importance of providing technical assistance where it could be beneficial, however. In some states, this discussion underscored how strong traditions of local control in education and other policy areas mitigate against state efforts to define standard approaches to school-based, work-based, or connecting activities to be developed by local partnerships.[10]

---

[10]In several states, however, education reform efforts to strengthen curriculum, change assessment practices, and establish standards are being pursued as state initiatives and impinge on some changes STW partnerships may seek to promote in schools and workplaces. Increasing emphasis on accountability in some states, for example, is expressed in introduction of proficiency exams which may make academic teachers increasingly reluctant to see students released from classes for workplace activities.

Some state directors, however, gave examples of specific ways in which their states had expressed STW priorities as they promoted local partnership formation, as well as requirements they posed for local partnerships:

- Utah required local applications to describe how partnerships would address six goals: collaboration, creation of career fields, curriculum integration, comprehensive guidance, work-based learning, and articulation.
- Florida asked local partnerships to organize their applications around nine concerns: public awareness, professional development, career guidance and counseling, support services, school-based programs, work-based programs, work-site development, student placement, and evaluation and outcomes.
- Maryland has not developed a particular STW model for the local partnerships but has required local partnerships to set aside a portion of their implementation grant for an employer incentive fund.[11] Maryland requires the local partnerships to provide a 50 percent match to the implementation grant.
- Indiana, although it has not yet issued an RFP for local partnership grants, plans to require that applicants explicitly plan for four kinds of work-based activities--internships, cooperative education, apprenticeship, and job shadowing--and that at least one of these activities must be paid.
- Colorado is stressing that local partnerships must work hard to maintain a balance in their local leadership between educators and private-sector employers and to avoid allowing either group to play too dominant a role.
- Iowa has put a lot of effort into defining career pathways and encourages local partnerships to focus on some or all of six career areas identified at the state level.
- Michigan has set forth specific statewide goals that should be reflected in local partnership efforts: expanding participation in registered youth apprenticeships, achieving participation by 50 percent of all high school students in at least some workplace or work-based experience by 1999, and broad implementation of industry skills standards in career/technical education programs.
- North Carolina is emphasizing the creation of career majors and "career major internships." It wants every local partnership to hire or designate a "job broker" to facilitate placement of students in workplace activities.

---

[11]Eligible participants (such as trade associations, labor organizations, and general business associations) can apply for a grant from the Employer Incentive Fund to develop employer involvement activities.

- Oregon stresses the development of career pathways and career majors, strengthening career guidance, developing workplace experiences, and--as part of broad education reforms--the use of Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery (CIMs and CAMs).

These items are only selected examples of states' efforts to convey what STW means to their local partnerships. In some cases, they may amount mostly to a reorganization or translation of concepts laid out in the STWOA. Discussions with state directors, however, suggested that the priorities and requirements often reflect substantial thought and deliberation on what aspects of STW concepts are most critical in their states and how STW relates to other school reforms under way.

Implementation Successes at the State and Substate Levels

The state-level STW implementation successes that state STW directors most consistently cited were in building state-level cooperation and promoting understanding of STW concepts among various state agencies and other key constituencies (Table 8). Almost half of the state directors specifically expressed satisfaction with the level of interagency collaboration achieved at the state level and the amount of work the state agencies have accomplished together in developing a state plan for STW. Achieving such collaboration is clearly only a first step in building STW systems; however, most of the 27 states had only recently begun forging these partnerships, so this progress should not be undervalued. Several state directors identified bringing employers into collaboration with public agencies and each other at the state level as a particularly successful aspect of early STW development. Of the six state directors citing progress in marketing STW, three specifically noted the effective marketing and promotion strategies their STW offices had developed and begun to carry out to convey positive and accurate messages about the need for and benefits of STW systems for students and for the economy.

Some states have already made substantial progress in creating materials that local partnerships can use in developing aspects of their STW systems. Seven state directors specifically noted progress they have made in developing career guidance and career exposure strategies and materials. The Utah state

TABLE 8

PRIMARY AREAS OF PROGRESS IN SCHOOL-TO-WORK IMPLEMENTATION

Primary Areas of Progress	Number of States Citing Progress in Area
State Level[a]	
Creating Collaborations at State Level	13
Developing Career Guidance/Exposure Activities	7
Building Local Partnerships	7
Marketing and Promoting STW	6
Creating a Common Vision for STW	6
Involving Employers in STW	4
Setting Industry Skills Standards	3
Creating Integrated Curricula Frameworks for STW	1
Substate Level[b]	
Developing Strong Partnerships	9
Involving Employers in STW	9
Developing Career Guidance/Exposure Activities	7
Linking Curricula Across Areas	5
Developing Career Pathways and Majors	5
Establishing Linkages Between Schools	4
Exposing Teachers to the Workplace	2
Raising Academic Standards	2
Incorporating Industry Skills Standards	1
Marketing and Promoting STW	1

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

NOTE: The interview guide requested the three most significant aspects of progress. Some state respondents only mentioned one or two areas of progress.

[a]Twenty-three state STW coordinators responded to the question about progress at the state level.

[b]Twenty-one state STW coordinators responded to the question about progress at the substate level.

director, for example, described his state's efforts to prepare a comprehensive career guidance system that exposes students to information about careers, beginning in elementary school and progressing through more extensive activities at higher grade levels. Three state directors expressed satisfaction with the progress they are making in establishing industry skill standards for adoption at the local level.

In some states, particularly those that only recently received federal implementation grants, attention has focused in recent months on establishing procedures for disbursing substate grants and on selecting substate grantees. State directors who commented on their progress in building local partnerships, however, generally were referring not only to solicitation of grant applications, but also to outreach efforts. These efforts often included meetings around the state with prospective local partner groups, to promote understanding of STW concepts, obtain local input to the formulation of a state vision for STW, and clarify what requirements grant applicants would have to fulfill.

Progress at the local level is more difficult for state directors to summarize succinctly, because local partnerships within each state are developing at different rates. Most commonly, state directors cited the creation of local partnerships as evidence in itself of implementation progress, since it is the first major challenge that needs to be accomplished at the local level. State directors have also been impressed with the progress local partnerships are making in including employers as partners in the development of STW, specifically in the employers' creation of work-based experiences for students. Next, state directors identified creation of career pathways and strengthening of career guidance as areas in which some local partnerships have made substantial headway.

Obstacles Encountered at the State and Substate Levels

State STW directors recognized some of the challenges and difficulties they face at both the state and substate level (Table 9). Concerns about particular challenges sometimes focused on the same aspects of STW implementation in which progress has been cited; state directors are basically pointing out that they value the progress that is made in overcoming obstacles. For example, several state directors were pleased

TABLE 9

PRIMARY OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED IN SCHOOL-TO-WORK IMPLEMENTATION

Obstacles	Number of States Citing Obstacle
State Level	
Lacking Understanding of and Expertise in STW	9
Bureaucratic Inertia/Conflict	5
Creating and Sustaining Cooperation and Collaboration	5
Time Pressures on Key Collaborative Partners	5
Involving Employers in STW	4
Federal Regulations and Funding	3
Local Funding Issues	3
Developing STW Curricula	3
Creating Change/Overcoming Tradition	3
Implementing STW in Rural or Urban Areas	2
Developing Statewide Skill Standards	2
Substate Level	
Lacking Understanding of Key STW Principles	13
Creating and Sustaining Cooperation and Collaboration	9
Creating Change/Overcoming Tradition	8
Implementing STW in Rural or Urban Areas	5
Time Pressures on School Staff and Other Key Staff Members	5
Getting School Administrators and/or Teachers to Embrace STW	4
Getting Employers Involved	3
Local Funding Issues	3
Redefining Guidance Counselor Functions	2
Including Special Populations in STW	2
Lack of Leadership	2
Creating STW Curricula	2

SOURCE: Telephone discussions with state STW directors, March-April 1996. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

NOTE: The interview guide asked for the three most significant obstacles or challenges to progress in STW implementation. Some state respondents only mentioned one or two obstacles being encountered.

with progress in creating and sustaining state-level collaboration. Some of the same directors and others, however, found that creating and sustaining these partnerships continues to be a challenge because of the diverging agendas and priorities of the different partners and the time pressures on key staff members who must promote collaboration.

Larger changes in state government have affected STW progress in a few states. In Massachusetts and Wisconsin, major government reorganization plans are being debated. Both state directors noted that progress on STW implementation, which depends on forging close working relationships among state agencies, is somewhat impeded by uncertainties about ultimate agency roles and responsibilities.

The obstacle most often cited by state directors is the lack of understanding of what STW means among parent and students, school staff, and even among some state agency staff. Several state coordinators emphasized the importance, and sometimes the difficulty, of conveying clearly to these groups that the development of STW systems is a broad, far-reaching reform effort, affecting students of all interests and capabilities, instead of another remake of vocational education for a narrow segment of the student population. This challenge is a major theme of many states' marketing and promotion efforts. It is related to the general difficulties some state directors cited in promoting change of any kind and breaking down traditional boundaries and limits on the roles of vocational and academic teachers, guidance counselors, and employers.

Obstacles and Solutions to Involving Employers in STW

State coordinators cite involving employers in STW as both an area in which they have made progress and an area in which they face obstacles (Tables 8 and 9). State directors generally are pleased with successes in getting employers to work with them on substantive issues related to STW. However, their comments frequently touched on the need for innovative ways to address employer concerns about three specific issues that can limit employer involvement at the local level: (1) employer liability, (2) child labor laws, and (3) lack of financial incentives. Overall, more than half of the state directors either described

particular innovative steps their states had taken to dealing with these concerns, or expressed concern about how these issues are limiting employer willingness and ability to provide work-based opportunities for students.

Several state directors described employers' reluctance to bring students into the workplace if they remain at risk for liability if students are injured. Current liability laws in many states could expose them to steep future insurance costs if a student is harmed, or to costly lawsuits. In some cases, these concerns appear to arise because employers do not see how students would be covered by standard workers' compensation. In some states, respondents merely expressed this as an issue impeding employers' involvement. Other states, however, have been actively seeking ways to address employers' concerns. For example:

- In Colorado, a bill in the state legislature would create tax credits for employers equivalent to costs they incur for workers' compensation to cover STW participants.
- In Hawaii, the state legislature passed a law that allows the state to assume the cost of workers' compensation for STW students at the workplace. The law also restricts employers' responsibility to including students under workers' compensation insurance coverage.
- The Massachusetts STW office is considering two possible remedies for liability concerns that could be brought before the legislature. First, they are considering an amendment to workers' compensation laws to allow employers to purchase insurance for *unpaid* students at a very low rate. Second, the amendment would create a statewide risk pool from which school districts or local partnerships could purchase insurance to cover students for all aspects of work-based learning.
- Iowa is creating a risk pool that local partnerships can buy into as a way of obtaining liability insurance to cover students at the work site.

Child labor laws in several states make it difficult for employers to provide work-based opportunities for students. A few STW coordinators stated that the child labor laws in their states are more restrictive than the federal laws and could impinge on their efforts to involve certain industries and occupations in STW. Several states (for example, Florida, Kentucky, and Maryland) are reviewing current regulations to decide what changes are needed to accommodate STW. Other states have already taken steps:

- Nebraska has a bill in the state legislature that would make its child labor law conform to the federal child labor law. Relaxing Nebraska's law, which is stricter than the federal law, would make it possible for students age 14 and older to participate in paid workplace activities.

- In Pennsylvania, a two-year state waiver of child labor regulations was obtained. The waiver allows 14- and 15-year-olds to participate in paid workplace experiences and career development activities during the school day.

- Individual employers in Wisconsin can obtain waivers to child labor laws to accommodate work-based learning opportunities for students. For example, one regulation prohibits individuals younger than age 18 from working around certain heavy equipment. To allow students in its workplace, a machinist shop was able to get a waiver of this regulation.

Finally, employers often do not see the financial benefit of providing these work-based opportunities for students. Instead, they are put off by the amount of time and resources it takes to have employees work with and train students without any direct financial benefit to the company. To counter the financial strain employers bear when offering work-based opportunities for STW students, several states have proposed tax credits for employers participating in STW:

- Hawaii's legislature is considering a bill that exempts employers from the standard employee tax for students who are in paid internships.

- A bill to provide a tax credit to employers who provide work-based experiences was recently put forward, but voted down, in the Indiana legislature.

- A bill has been introduced into the Michigan legislature that would give employers a tax credit of up to $2,000 for each high school student enrolled in a registered youth apprenticeship program. The aim is to expand the number of students in such programs.

Role of the National STW Office

For help in overcoming these obstacles and developing their STW systems, states can turn to the national STW office for assistance. The 27 state STW coordinators were consistent in their appreciation of the office's work and the helpful and supportive approach that characterizes its interactions with state STW offices. The technical assistance pool that implementation states can access through the line of credit established by the national office was favorably received. However, one respondent thought that the money

set aside for each state was insufficient, and a few states have not been able to find a match between the available providers and their own needs.

The state respondents had specific suggestions for useful extensions of the help they are already getting from the STW office:

- A source of best practices in STW and examples of how other states are dealing with STW issues
- A more coordinated, consistent, and persistent campaign for STW by the key national leaders, including efforts by the President and the Secretaries of Education and Labor to emphasize that STW is a broadly applicable set of reforms instead of a narrow vocational program for students not going to college
- Help in addressing key components of STW, such as involving employers and developing skill standards

In general, however, the STW directors were pleased with the assistance they have received. A few mentioned that they were modeling their delivery of technical assistance to local partnerships on the voucher approach used at the federal level, by planning to provide local partnerships with a roster of available sources of help and an account they could draw down by tapping those sources.

APPENDIX A

TOPICS FOR TELEPHONE DISCUSSIONS WITH STATE STW DIRECTORS

TOPICS FOR TELEPHONE DISCUSSIONS WITH STW DIRECTORS

1. Organization for STW System Implementation at the State Level

2. Definition and Funding of Local Partnerships

   a. General organizational framework for STW partnerships
   b. Funding framework

3. STW Priorities and Strategies

4. Support for STW Implementation

   a. Technical assistance provided to local partnerships
   b. Other funds allocated for STW
   c. Use of STW funds at the state level
   d. Support of the national STW office